

IN LONDON JAMAICAN

J.K. Local, W.H.G. Wells and M. Sebba

(University of York)

The aims of this paper can be divided into three: typological, sociolinguistic and methodological. A recurrent problem for creolists who study a Creole (such as London Jamaican) which is in continued contact with its principal lexifier (in this case English) is to establish a typological basis for comparing and contrasting the two. This problem is especially acute when, as in the case of many Caribbean creoles, Creole speakers themselves often do not acknowledge the Creole as a separate language from the standard. Yet communicative breakdowns do occur between Creole and Standard users: one purpose which a typological comparison would serve would be to isolate points of systemic divergence which might lead to such breakdowns. Such an analysis would thus have sociolinguistic implications. In order to make a typological comparison it is necessary to have analytical techniques which allow independent investigation of the relevant sub-systems of the two languages: if the analysis of, say, a creole intonation system is predicated on units of structure and paradigmatic oppositions that have been set up for the lexifier, the resultant comparative statement is bound to be circular. An area of creole that has received relatively little scholarly attention is that of prosodic and intonational features (though see Carter 1979, 1982). A probable reason for this neglect is the methodological difficulty that the study of such systems presents, and in particular the problem of warranting the phonological categories used by reference to non-intuitive evidence that is not derived from the input languages. On the other hand, it is often suggested that prosodic features are particularly salient in identifying a speaker as creole (or non-standard generally). In the context of London Jamaican, non-LJ speakers have reported feeling threatened by LJ speakers in conversation. For such reasons, it seemed to us that an effort should be made to overcome the methodological problems involved in this type of analysis and thus to provide a basis for investigating whether or not such reports are based on a misinterpretation by the listener of a non-standard system, i.e. on systemic mismatch. The present paper is largely concerned with demonstrating the methodology and procedure we consider best suited for this task: the incorporation of our findings into a comparative statement has not yet been undertaken.

London Jamaican, the language on which this study is based, is a language spoken by young Afro-Caribbeans born and living in London. It is similar to, but also significantly different from, Jamaican Creole, the vernacular of Jamaica. The principal influences on it, apart from Jamaican Creole, seem to be London English and other Caribbean varieties, such as Barbadian. Because of the nature of their community most Afro-Caribbeans born in London speak the local variety of London English natively and use it in all formal situations and whenever talking to white people other than close friends of the same age group: LJ has a more limited use, among siblings, among friends, in the 'sub-cultures' of reggae and Rastafari. The recordings which provide the data for this paper were made by Sebba at a senior high school in the East London Borough of Waltham Forest. They took place between two sixth-form girls (Corpus G) and two fifth-form boys (Corpus B), and were produced at the researcher's request: in each case he asked the participants to "talk Jamaican" for ten minutes or so. The conversations are therefore to a greater or lesser extent a performance, but nevertheless seem true to the character of LJ as recorded on other occasions and in other schools.

The transcription used in the LJ examples makes no claim to represent

segmental phonological systems. It is designed to be easily readable, whilst being constrained by the need to show the correct number of syllables (for pitch analysis). Where reference is made to phonetic features of a portion of an extract, that portion is given in impressionistic transcription. The data was transcribed impressionistically in detail by the three authors independently, discrepancies being resolved by discussion. This impressionistic transcription provides the basis for the phonological analysis.

Most students of English intonation have wanted to recognize the tonic (nucleus, nuclear tone) as the key structural unit in their descriptions. A dual function has been attributed to the tonic, though not always explicitly. Firstly, the tonic serves as one of the delimitative signals for the tone unit, in as much as there can only be one tonic per tone unit, and secondly, the tonic has been equated with information focus. This coincidence of functions has led to some analytical confusion in studies of English intonation, and in particular to a tendency to regard phonological units (i.e. the tonic) which have been established in the first instance by phonetic criteria of similarity and difference, as isomorphic with semantic functions (i.e. focus) in the subsequent description. The need for a clear distinction between functional and phonetic criteria in phonological description is most pressing in so-called 'intonational' phonology. In this respect, two aspects of LJ are of particular interest. Firstly, LJ does not seem to utilize a combination of phonetic events that we, as English speakers, respond to as a 'tonic'. Secondly, the functions of focus and delimitation are not jointly manifested. It was our observation of the first of these characteristics, in the context of a study of the unusually frequent sentence-final tag you know, that led to our investigation of the second aspect. The presentation of our findings reflects this 'discovery procedure'.

Our interest in the data was aroused initially by the speakers' use of the lexical sequence you know, which differs markedly from realisations of this tag in our own varieties of British English. You know occurs with very great frequency, especially in Corpus B. It appears to have stereotypical value: when one boy (not one of the informants represented here) gave a mock interview in the role of a 'toasting artist' - a popular figure for young Afro-Caribbeans - virtually every sentence ended with you know. Our first observations may be summarised as follows:

- a) you regularly occurs on the same pitch as the syllable(s) preceding, or at a lower pitch, and is rhythmically integrated with them.
- b) To us as English listeners, the pitch movement on know seems short, in both corpuses. In Corpus B, it is a fall over a narrow pitch range.
- c) In Corpus B, the pitch movement on know is the most noticeable on-syllable pitch movement in the sentence.

Some of these features are illustrated in extracts (1) and (2). In both examples, 'know' is the only syllable that reaches the base of the speaker's normal range, and although in absolute terms quite narrow, the fall on 'know' constitutes the widest on-syllable pitch movement in each utterance. In both examples again, the two syllables of the tag are rhythmically short, and, insofar as the notion of rhythmical feet (Abercrombie 1964) can be invoked impressionistically in the description of this non-standard variety, our impression is that the tag in neither case constitutes a separate foot, but is linked to the preceding syllables. In (1) this impression may be due in part to the relative loudness of 'law'; in both (1) and (2), relevant features are the absence of step up in pitch to 'you' from the preceding syllable and the short duration of both syllables of the tag.

These observations suggested to us that dynamic pitch movement is not an exponent of information focus in LJ as it is in Standard English, but simply serves to mark the end of a sentence. They were reinforced by extracts (3) and (4). In (3), the speakers are discussing the death of a local black youth. The point of interest is the reiterated pronominal 'him'. It is clear from the context that 'him' has the same reference throughout the extract. In many varieties of English, pronominals are not accented in such contexts; in particular, they are 'deaccented' when sentence-final, that is when in the unmarked position for sentence accent, since noticeable 'stress' on pronominals (possible exponents of which are major pitch movement, increased loudness, rhythmical prominence) forces the interpretation that the pronominal is not coreferential with its conventional antecedent. In (3), however, whilst 'him' clearly has the same reference throughout, and is thus conventional (rather than contrastive or deictic, for instance), it carries the major pitch movement of the sentence when sentence-final. In I's turn, the pitch on 'him' falls to the bottom of the speaker's usual range; there is an increase in loudness towards the end of the sentence that is sustained through 'him'; and 'him' is not rhythmically weaker than the preceding syllables - indeed the whole utterance gives an impression of syllable-timing. These three features give an impression of saliency to the syllable displaying them; furthermore, the first two are noticeably absent from the earlier occurrence of 'him' in the same utterance. In F's turn, the first 'him' also occurs at a sentence boundary - a major syntactic completion point which is potentially a place for turn transition. It too is as loud as the preceding word, and has on-syllable pitch movement, though not to the bottom of the range. The two remaining instances of 'him' in F's turn do not display these features. This fragment thus suggests that dynamic pitch is associated with turn-completion: I's second 'him' is followed by a turn-change, unlike the other four 'him's. F's first 'him' has some, but not all, of the features isolated at I's second 'him'. This may well have to do with the fact that although F's first 'him' occurs at a major syntactic boundary it is not followed by a change of speaker. The occurrence of on-syllable pitch movement is clearly not constrained by considerations of information structure and anaphoric reference that operate in other varieties of English. Further evidence of this is provided by extract (4), where once again a word is repeated ('the law'), in a discussion of police behaviour. Rules of information structure for Standard English require that once a lexical item has occurred, in its subsequent appearances in the discourse it is 'given' and will not receive the sentence accent (Halliday 1967). This is the classic motivation for de-accenting, whereby the main accent is shifted leftwards off the last lexical item of the sentence (Ladd 1980; Wells and Local forthcoming). In (4), however, it is the fourth occurrence of 'law' which displays the biggest pitch movement of the entire turn - and it is followed by a change of speaker. Unlike this fourth occurrence of 'law', the second and third instances of the word, also informationally 'given', do not display any pitch movement and are not loud. If pitch movement were an exponent of new information focus in LJ, as it is in RP and other varieties, we might expect the first occurrence of 'law' to display a pitch glide; but although it is relatively loud and long, on-syllable pitch movement is very slight and hard to distinguish from the intrinsic pitch change of the diphthongal glide.

Extract 5 provides further evidence that in LJ, dynamic pitch is associated with delimitation but not with information focus. Lexically and syntactically, 'Stylers' and 'Slickers' (two groups of young blacks) represent a clear case of contrastive focus, in terms of the information structure of the utterance, yet the prosodic marking of this contrastive function is strikingly different from its marking in those varieties of English that have been investigated to date. Whereas in other varieties of English, contrast of this kind is associated with

maximal pitch movement (e.g. fall from top to base of pitch range: c.f. Wells forthcoming), here there is no movement at all on 'slickers' and barely any on 'stylers'. Instead, the largest pitch movements occur on 'know' - a sentence boundary and therefore a potential turn transition point - and on the final syllable of 'wicked', after which the turn does actually change. As for the contrasted items, they occur very high in the pitch range, but on a level pitch. Other noteworthy features of these items are the long initial consonants and the following acceleration in tempo: the exponents of focus and contrast will not however, be further discussed in the present paper, which is concerned with delimitation, but will form the subject of a second paper.

On the basis of data such as this, we adopted the working hypothesis that in LJ the system of delimitation and the system of information focus are distinct. LJ would therefore differ from other varieties of English spoken within the same geographical area and possibly even by the same speakers. This might be responsible for the strong impression of English speakers that LJ is distinctly non-English prosodically, and at times difficult to understand, in spite of a good deal of shared lexis and syntax. This hypothesis therefore seemed to be worthy of further investigation, not only for its intrinsic linguistic interest as a contribution to the study of accentual systems, but also for its possible social implications. The findings we present below are restricted to the delimitative features associated with declarative sentences.

The idea that delimitative signals have an ancillary status is one that goes back at least as far as Trubetskoy. It presumably arises from the assumption that their function is to delimit syntactically defined units, such as the sentence. It is clearly the case that not every sentence, as defined by its syntactic structure, has its boundary signalled phonetically, but some do. Instead of therefore concluding that there is a system of sentence delimitation, which is optional, we propose that the domain of those delimitative features sometimes associated with the sentence is not in fact the sentence itself but a higher structural unit - the turn - and that the sentence will be delimited just in the case where it is coextensive with a turn. The 'optional' nature of sentence delimitation will then be accounted for by the facts that one sentence may constitute a turn, but a turn may consist of an indefinite sequence of sentences.

In adopting this proposal we seek, by examining the observable behaviour of participants in the talk, to provide a warrant for the functional category of delimitation. We take it as axiomatic that it is not sufficient to rely on the intuitions of the native speaker as to which intonational distinctions are meaningful and which are not, and then to use these judgements, in conjunction with distributional regularities in the phonic data, as the basis for establishing phonological categories, since intuitions about 'intonation' are even more unreliable and difficult to access than other linguistic intuitions.

By making use of speaker behaviour as an analytical resource we have access to a non-intuitive warrant for the functional category of delimitation. We shall now use this resource in the phonological analysis of turn-delimitation in LJ. The structural unit turn is identified in the first instance as a spate of talk by one speaker followed by a change of speaker in the clear (i.e. not in overlap). We take as primary evidence for the delimitative function, points in the talk where the listener/coparticipant treats the speaker's turn as complete, and demonstrates that he is doing so. As primary evidence for an instance of turn delimitation, we use conversational criteria: second speaker starts to talk at a completion point in first speaker's turn, as in Extract 6. In the first instance, we restrict our investigation of delimitation to the (numerous) sentences

in the data ending with you know. These form two distinct analytic groups, henceforth Group I and Group II. Group I comprises the bulk of the instances of you know in the boys' conversation and a few of those in the girls' conversation. The phonetic characteristics of Group I are:

a) narrow falling pitch movement to the bottom of the speaker's pitch range on the word know, with accompanying creaky phonation;

b) the starting point of this pitch movement is never higher than the preceding syllable: it may be below or at the same level;

c) absence of decrescendo on know, in spite of frequent decrescendo over the preceding portion of utterance, leading to an impression of a resurgence of loudness;

d) absence of greater dynamic pitch movement earlier in the utterance.

Extract (6) exemplifies these features: there is a narrow fall to the base of the speaker's normal range on 'know', which starts at the same height as 'you' and is the final word of I's turn; there is no greater on-syllable pitch movement earlier in the turn; and there is no drop in loudness over the final part of the turn. I's turn is followed by a change of speaker, and the fact that I's turn is designed and treated as complete is further attested by the pause that intervenes between the two turns: I does not continue talking after 'you know', which indicates that the features displayed at the end of his turn are not being used to project further talk and thus hold the turn for the current speaker. The same sequence can be observed in (7) and (8).

Extracts (6), (7) and (8) represent clear instances where turn transition is achieved without problems for the participants and where the phonetic features provisionally associated with turn delimitation are displayed. In (9) we find the same phonetic features. In I's turn, 'know' has the greatest on-syllable pitch movement; it starts at the same height as 'you' and falls to the base of the speaker's normal range. As in (6) to (8), there is then a change of speaker, but this time with no intervening pause. In fact, the two turns are latched: they could not be closer together without being in overlap. Yet there is no indication that the transition is in any way problematic for the participants: I does not attempt to come in again while F's turn is in progress. This suggests that in (6) to (8) it was not simply the pause that indicated to the second speaker that the first speaker had completed his turn, but that features (a - d) are involved in projecting turn completion. Further evidence is provided by the changes of turn in (10). In both F's turns, 'know' carries the greatest on-syllable pitch movement in the utterance; this begins at the level of the preceding 'you' and reaches the bottom of the speaker's normal range. In the second turn, there is a clear resurgence of loudness on 'know'. Following both turns there is a latched transition, yet in neither case does the transition cause any problems for the participants, as can be seen from the fact that F does not attempt to continue his talk during I's turns. In the absence of even the slightest intervening pause, change of turn is effected smoothly, indicating that the features associated with 'you know' are projecting turn completion. The transition from F's first turn to I's second turn in (11) displays the same features, once again demonstrating the precision with which speakers orient to the projected delimitation of the turn: 'know' begins at a lower pitch than the preceding syllable, falls to the base of the speaker's range, and there is no earlier on-syllable pitch movement in the utterance; I's incoming, 'slap', is latched onto 'you know', and there is no indication from F that this is unexpected or unwanted.

The first transition in (11) presents a rather more complex situation.

Once again, the delimitative features are present at the end of I's turn, which is treated as complete by F, who comes in after a brief pause. However, I resumes talk almost simultaneously with F, only to drop out and relinquish the floor to F. At first glance, this may appear to contradict the claim that features (a - d) project turn-completion, since I does not relinquish the turn after displaying the features, even though F starts to talk. Closer examination suggests, however, that I's talk in overlap with F's turn ('him can't hold me') does not constitute a claim to hold the floor, but is presented as a footnote to his original talk. Firstly, it is lexically and syntactically an exact repetition of the original turn, and as such adds no new information at all to the discourse. Secondly, it seems to be subordinated prosodically to what precedes: the pitch range of the repeated phrase is markedly lower overall than that of the preceding talk, and it is quieter. Thirdly, these prosodic features do not constitute I's talk as turn-competitive, i.e. as an attempt to regain the floor, if the interruptive strategies of LJ are at all comparable to those of Standard English as described by French and Local (1983), who identify high pitch and extra loudness as markers of turn-competitive incomings. Fourthly, F does not treat I's talk as an attempt to hold the floor by speaking slowly and loudly in order to fend off the competition (French and Local op.cit. p.26). Rather, F seems to proceed normally, as if I's talk did not present any problem to the changeover of turn that has just taken place. Fifthly, the brief pause that precedes F's talk and the indistinctness of his first syllable (transcribed 'em') suggest that I's resumption of talk may be a response to F's failure to take up the offer of a turn as quickly and as clearly as he might. In (12) we find a different type of overlapping talk, and this too points to the precise orientation of participants to the turn-delimitative features. I comes in during the course of F's first turn, but breaks off (at a syntactically incomplete point), only resuming after F's 'you know'. This 'you know' has the features identified with delimitation (fall to base of range, not starting higher than the preceding syllable; no bigger pitch glide in the utterance; lack of diminuendo), and is followed by a no-pause transition, as in extracts (9) and (10). The fact that I breaks off his original talk without even completing it syntactically, in conjunction with the fact that when he does resume, he repeats and continues his original phrase, indicates that he treats his original talk as lost, and thus his original incoming as illegitimate, i.e. placed at a point where change of turn is dispreferred (cf. Jefferson and Schegloff 1975).

To this point we have not shown that it is the phonetic parameters rather than the lexical stretch 'you know' which constitute turns as complete. Clear evidence that phonetic features are constitutive of turn-endings is provided by an examination of the second group of you know turns. These (Group II) occur almost exclusively in the girls' conversation. The phonetic characteristics of Group II are:

EITHER step up in pitch from you to know, with pitch on know level or level plus slight rise;

OR step up to know and rising pitch on know.

Whereas Group I you know never elicits a response in overlap, in Group II the majority do. In (13), B has been talking about a male friend whom she talked to at a recent party, and concludes her account of the meeting. The fall on 'self' is the biggest on-syllable pitch movement in B's utterance, and it is the only syllable to reach the base of the speaker's usual range, having started at the same level as the preceding syllable. These features, which occur on the word immediately preceding the 'you know' tag, were associated with the final word of the tag itself in Group I fragments. Conversely, the tag itself is quite different from Group I you know: there is a step up in pitch, and a level pitch on 'know' rather than a fall to the base of the speaker's range. Furthermore, B's turn elicits a different type of response, namely a supportive token which is

uttered by A in overlap with the tag. This overlapping response does not, however, cause any apparent problems for B: she does not try to regain the turn, but allows A to pause and then change the topic. There is therefore no evidence that B construes A's response as competitive or that B has not designed her own turn as complete. Some of the same features can be noted in (14) and (15).

Thus, Group II you know, whilst differing somewhat from standard varieties of English in the phonetic detail of its exponents, can be identified functionally with the use of this tag in standard varieties, as characterised by Sacks et al (1974, pp.707, 708, 718): by employing a tag such as you know, speaker transforms his turn into a locus of 'current speaker selects next' after an initial transition relevance place (i.e. the syntactic completion point immediately preceding the tag). Significantly, the phonetic features associated with the talk immediately preceding 'you know' in Group II, after which overlapping talk begins, are the same as the features (a - d) which we identified earlier as signalling turn delimitation in Group I. Thus, in addition to signalling to hearer that the turn is over (by delimitative signals at the first completion point), speaker adds a tag which directly selects a respondent, thus requiring a response. As might be expected, such tags are often overlapped by incoming talk (cf. Sacks et al., 1974). With Group I you know, on the other hand, we cannot identify two interactive components in the same way. Instead, the next-selecting potential of you know is integrated into the delimitation of the turn: the option is not available to the speaker to manipulate these two interactive components separately. The consequences this has for the management of talk, and particularly of talk between speakers using the Group I system and speakers using a 'standard', two-component system such as Group II or the variety described by Sacks et al., could be such as to constitute a potential source of misunderstanding.

Misunderstandings would presumably be most likely in a situation where neither participant in the interaction has the other's system in his competence, and less likely where the participants have both systems available, as seems to be the case with the girls represented in our data. Sociolinguistic implications of the prosodic systems we have identified will form the subject of a separate study.

The hypothesis that turn-delimitation is associated with the phonetic features isolated for Group I you know, is supported by a further, quite general property of the data: the features are also associated with turn-final items other than you know, in the speech of all four informants. For instance, in I's turn in (16), the only on-syllable pitch movement is the narrow fall on the final word, 'time', which starts at the level of the preceding word, 'one', and reaches the base of the speaker's range, without trailing off in loudness. F's response is latched onto I's turn, which indicates that F orients finely to these phonetic features as marking the end of the turn. Similarly, in (17) F's turn displays the delimitative features. There is no on-syllable pitch movement apart from the narrow fall on 'bad', starting at the same level as the preceding syllable and reaching the base of the range; an immediate change of speaker follows. Another instance was discussed earlier: in I's turn in extract (4), the final occurrence of 'law' is contextually given; nevertheless it carries a falling pitch movement to the base of the range, is relatively loud, and is followed by a change of turn. The only earlier pitch fall that reaches the base of the range is on 'you know', which also elicits a response. I's first turn 'mi know' in (10) also displays features (a - d), and is followed by a change of speaker; indeed, the association is overwhelmingly characteristic of the boys' talk.

It is regularly present in the girls' conversation too. In (18), there is a narrow fall to the base of the range on the final syllable of B's turn. This

fall starts below the level of the preceding syllable; there is no earlier on-syllable pitch movement and no diminuendo. The change of speaker indicates that A orients to B's turn as having been completed. In extract (5) above, the features are again observable, on B's final phrase 'it was wicked'. These two examples are of special interest since they exhibit a common phenomenon in our LJ data: turn-final polysyllabic words that in standard English are conventionally assigned non-final stress (Winston, wicked) we perceive as being 'stressed' on the final syllable. This suggests that the delimitative system identified here for turns can 'override' lexical stress assignment rules - a phenomenon which would repay further investigation, since it implies a further quite fundamental phonological difference between LJ and other varieties of English.

Further evidence for the claim that the phonetic features we have isolated are exponents of the turn delimitative function is furnished by the recurrent failure of next speaker to come in at points in current speaker's turn where the syntax is complete but which do not display features (a - d). Notably, in Group 1 utterances with you know, such as (6 - 12) above, second speaker never comes in immediately prior to the tag, although syntactically a potential sentence termination has been reached. In Group 1, features (a - d) are never associated with this point, whereas in Group 2, where these features are present immediately before the tag, next speaker frequently starts to talk in overlap with the tag, as we have seen. Extract (10) presents striking exemplification of this 'disjunction' between phonetics and syntax. In F's second turn there is a major syntactic break - an unambiguous sentence boundary - between 'stop it' and 'them is'. Since the sentence is the turn-constructional unit par excellence at the syntactic level of description, one might anticipate a change of speaker following 'stop it', but this does not happen: in fact, F latches his two sentences together. Furthermore, the delimitative features are not in evidence at 'stop it': the final syllable is not at the base of the speaker's range, nor does it have falling pitch, yet there is earlier on-syllable pitch movement, on 'thief'. In spite of its syntactic completeness, the first part of F's utterance is not marked prosodically as a turn-constructional unit and is not treated as a complete turn by the coparticipant in the talk.

We have shown that turn delimitation in LJ is realised by particular pitch characteristics of the final syllable of a syntactically complete piece, in conjunction with other phonetic features of the piece involving loudness as well as pitch. It could also be maintained that these features are sentence delimitative, but only to the extent that they are also associated with some syntactically complete pieces after which there is no change of speaker, for it has also been shown that syntactically complete declarative sentences are often not accompanied by these features, and again are not followed by change of speaker. These claims have been substantiated by examination of the interactive and phonetic characteristics of two types of you know identified in the data, then of other turn-final pieces. The findings indicate that LJ differs from other varieties of English, in which the occurrence of dynamic pitch at the end of a syntactic piece is constrained by considerations of information focussing. In a second paper, we shall develop our claim that information focus and contrast in LJ are not realised by dynamic pitch (as is the case in standard English: see Wells, forthcoming) but by other phonetic features. Instances of information focus, presented informally in (3 - 6), will be identified in the second paper on the basis of interactive evidence, of the same kind as has been used to identify the delimitative function. By using such evidence, the analyst can show which phonetic features are functionally relevant for the participants in the conversation, and thus provide a warrant for categories used. This approach

to delimitation and focus is not one that has been adopted, to our knowledge, in the field of 'intonation' studies, although it draws upon procedures developed within the ethnomethodological discipline of Conversation Analysis (C.A.). A coherent theory of delimitation, and thence of discourse, requires that each delimitative function - of words, of longer syntactic pieces, or of discourse pieces - be analysed on its own terms, on the basis of non-intuitive evidence of the type used here, and without prejudice as to the phonic features involved. Only after such an analysis has been made does it become meaningful to make statements about phonological systems.

Our analysis suggests that London Jamaican differs from other varieties of English in two important ways: the domain over which the bundle of delimitative features operates, and the role played by dynamic pitch as an exponent of delimitation. Recent work on localised Tyneside English confirms this (Local, Kelly and Wells, forthcoming). Varieties of English such as Tyneside, Edinburgh (Brown et al 1980), and RP differ from each other in the phonetic exponents of turn delimitation but not in the phonological domain of these exponents (the final foot of the piece). London Jamaican, by contrast, differs from these varieties in both respects.

References

- Abercrombie, D. 1964. 'Syllable quantity and enclitics in English' in D. Abercrombie et al (eds.) In honour of Daniel Jones. London: Longman.
- Brown, G., K.L. Currie and J. Kenworthy. 1980. Questions of intonation. London: Croom Helm.
- Carter, H. 1979. 'Evidence for the survival of African prosodies in Caribbean Creoles'. Society for Caribbean Linguistics Occasional Paper 13.
1982. 'The tonal system of Jamaican English'. Paper presented at the Fourth Biennial Conference of the Society for Caribbean Linguistics, Paramaribo, Suriname, September 1982.
- French, P. and J.K. Local. 1983. 'Turn-competitive incomings'. Journal of Pragmatics 7, 17-38.
- Halliday, M.A.K. 1967. 'Notes on transitivity and theme in English, Part 2'. Journal of Linguistics 3, 199-244.
- Jefferson, G. and E.A. Schegloff. 1975. 'Sketch: some orderly aspects of overlap in natural conversation'. Paper delivered to the 74th Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, San Francisco.
- Ladd, D.R. 1980. The structure of intonational meaning. Indiana University Press.
- Local, J.K., J. Kelly and W.H.G. Wells. 'Some phonetic aspects of turn-delimitation in the speech of urban Tynesiders'. To appear in memorial volume for Barbara Strang.
- Sacks, H., E.A. Schegloff and G. Jefferson. 1974. 'A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation'. Language 50, 696-735.
- Wells, W.H.G. (forthcoming) 'An experimental approach to the interpretation of focus in spoken English'. To appear in C. Johns-Lewis (ed.) Studies in intonation and discourse. London: Croom Helm, 1984.
- Wells, W.H.G. and J.K. Local (forthcoming) 'You don't have to resort to syntax'. To appear in York Papers in Linguistics 10.

7

[ff]

I: them a:lways come and stop me for nothing you know (0.4)

[f]

F: true enough

8

[f] [f]

I: me used see him you know (0.5)

[f]

F: yeah

5

[accel.]

B: not s:tylers go there s:o you know

[tense, narrow]

B: s:lickers go there so you know / it was w:ick:ed

[PP pp]

A: mhm f* * * * top shoes 'n clothes

6

[mf] [mf]

I: it true that them p'licemen them fresh you know (*)

F: yeah

11

I: him can't hold me you know (0.4) him can't hold me

F: em (k* * *) / thump him down

you know =

I: = s:lap up him: b umberklaat one time you know (0.8) sure

F: h mhm

I: all them(.) p'licemen them soft you know =

[p p]

F: = yeeh them soft you know

10 I: [f] [f] [f] [f] [f]

F: some of them p'lice is the biggest thief agoin: you know =

I: = me know

F: [f] [f] [f] [f]

F: them is the biggest thief and them a try stop it = them is a ras

[f] [f]

F: thief you know =

I: = yunu could just walk down a street so

[accel.]
B: tell him to coo:l himse:l f: you know

[pp pp]
huh huh/ (·) hh (·) ʔah (2.5)

F: them thump him and / everything you know

I: dem two o' me (Id)

[f]

I: two o' me (Idrin dem awatching) it you know (·)

[accel.]

F: yeah they thump him them thump him good an' proper you know

A: v' you seen Benita

14

[accel.]

B: this either Saturday or Sunday I'm not quite sure you know / (1.0)

m hm

B: but should be good hhh I hope so (1.2)

A: me I've nowhere to go

17

A: v' you seen Benita

F: nothing more them thump him bad =

B: B'nita come rou':; last night

I: = them thump him and kill him (0.5)

B: see her phone her all the time (0.2) y'know

F: true

A: m hm / Yeah (0.2)

18

B: tch (.) dread (.) tch

B: on Saturday night me see the one Winston (0.2)

16

I: (s'mone should come blow'p a) p'lice station one time: =

A: yeah

F: = mhm (laugh) Leyton P'lice station

B: yeah me see him Saturday night

I: mm
